## Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM, Plaintiff,

v.

EDWARD J. DAVILA, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:18-cv-02488-JD

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Pro se plaintiff Arunachalam filed an amended complaint after the Court struck the original complaint for including the home addresses of judges of this court. Dkt. No. 9. The amended complaint runs to 195 pages and purports to sue, among others, former President Obama, a current United States Senator, most of the justices of the Supreme Court, several Federal Circuit judges, and judges on federal and state courts in Delaware, Texas and this district. The amended complaint is accompanied by hundreds of pages of exhibits.

The Court dismisses the complaint on its own motion under Rule 8, Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662 (2009), and Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007). The amended complaint is an incomprehensible morass of allegations that are a far cry from a short and plain statement of claims and the Court's jurisdiction over them. A putative defendant would not know where to begin in responding, and the Court cannot determine whether anything in this tangle of allegations is sufficient to state a claim. Plaintiff's pro se status does not relieve her of conformity to the pleading rules. See, e.g., Romano v. United States Army Core of Engineers, No. 3:17-CV-00930-JD, 2017 WL 6448221, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2017).

Plaintiff may have a third and final attempt to properly plead a claim, if she so chooses. The second amended complaint must be filed by June 7, 2018. Plaintiff is cautioned that judicial

## United States District Court Northern District of California

officers are rarely, if ever, properly named as defendants for conduct related to the performance of their offices. Plaintiff is also advised that no further opportunity to amend is likely to be afforded after the second amended complaint. No defendant served with the second amended complaint, if any, need respond until directed to by the Court. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 17, 2018 JAMES PONATO United tates District Judge